AP
TGW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re Application of	
Inventor: Larry E. Spencer	: Confirmation No. 2789
	:
U.S. Patent Application No. 10/812,027	: Group Art Unit: 3661
	:
Filed: March 30, 2004	: Examiner: Thu V. Nguyen
	:
For: PORTABLE VEHICLE NAVIGATION SYSTEM	

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Attn: BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Sir:

Further to the Notice of Appeal filed August 29, 2005, and responsive to the Notice of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief mailed November 23, 2005, in connection with the above-identified application on appeal, herewith is Appellants' Amended Brief on Appeal. The statutory fee of $500 was paid on August 29, 2005.

To the extent necessary, Appellant hereby requests any required extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge any required fees not otherwise provided for to Deposit Account No. 07-1337.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

I. Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest is Magellan DIS, Inc.

II. Related Appeals and Interferences

There are no related appeals and/or interferences.

III. Status of Claims

No claims are allowed.

Claims 1, 3, 5-31 and 33-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamiya et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,917,435) in view of Kodama (JP 10-213443) and further in view of Hollenberg (U.S. Patent No. 6,091,956).

Claims 23 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamiya in view of Kodama and further in view of Ito et al (U.S. Patent 5,889,337).

Claims 24-28, 39, and 41-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamiya in view of Kodama and further in view of Ito and Avitan (4,942,529).

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamiya in view of Kodama and further in view of Ito, Avitan, and Hollenberg.

IV. Status of Amendments

There are no unentered amendments.

V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The present claimed subject matter in an apparatus embodiment is a vehicle navigation system 20 including an operator interface module (OIM) 22, a docking station 24, and a computer module 26. (Instant specification at page 3, line 22 through page 4, line 1 and FIG. 1). Computer module 26 is "removably secured in the docking station 24" and selectively mechanically locked in the docking station 24 via latches 42. (Instant specification at page 4, lines 11-13). Computer module 26 includes a processor, i.e., CPU 56, and a map database, i.e., database 60 of roads to be traveled by the vehicle navigation system 20. (Instant specification at page 5, lines 6-9 and FIG. 2).

Computer module 26 also includes a navigational sensor, e.g., an accelerometer 64 and a GPS receiver 62, "providing position and motion data to the CPU 56." (Instant specification at page 6, lines 9-10). Additional navigational sensors forming a part of computer module 26 may include: a gyro 65, a compass 66, an altimeter 67, etc. (Instant specification at page 6, lines 10-12).

As described above, the present claimed subject matter provides a vehicle navigation system which is easily transportable by a consumer between vehicles. (Instant specification at page 1, lines 22-23 and page 9, lines 11-17). Additionally, significant components of such a vehicle navigation system are transportable between vehicles and the most expensive components need not be purchased for each vehicle. (Instant specification at page 1, lines 23-24 and page 2, line 21 through page 3, line 1 and page 9, lines 11-17).

One or more of the foregoing advantages are achieved by the present claimed subject matter as recited in the apparatus of independent claim 1 which provides: "A vehicle navigation system comprising: a computer module including a processor and a map database; a docking station, said computer module selectively matable with said docking station; wherein the computer module further includes at least one navigational sensor."

Further, one or more of the foregoing advantages are achieved by the present claimed subject matter as recited in the apparatus of independent claim 14 which provides: "A vehicle navigation system comprising: a docking station fixedly mounted in a first vehicle; a computer module including a CPU, map database, GPS receiver and at least one accelerometer, the computer module comprising a self-contained unit which is selectively matable with and removable from the docking station, the computer module including a first electrical connector which is electrically connected with a second electrical connector on the docking station when the computer module is mated to the docking station, said second electrical connector being electrically connected to a power supply in the first vehicle; and an operator interface module selectively electrically connected to the CPU of the computer module, said operator interface module including a display and a plurality of user activatable switches."

Further, one or more of the foregoing advantages are achieved by the present claimed subject matter as recited in the apparatus of independent claim 18 which provides: "A vehicle navigation system comprising: a computer module including a CPU, map database, first vehicle data, second vehicle data, and at least one of an inertial sensor and a GPS receiver; said computer module utilizing said first vehicle data when the computer module is installed in the first vehicle and said second vehicle data when said computer module is installed in the second vehicle."

The present claimed subject matter in a method embodiment includes a method for using a vehicle navigation system. The method includes installing, i.e., removably securing, the navigation system in a first vehicle. (Instant specification at page 7, lines 14-18). The navigation system is described above and includes a computer module 26 including a processor and a map database. "[T]he computer module 26 is slid into a docking station 24 of the first vehicle 72." (Instant specification at page 7, lines 14-15 and FIG. 1). The vehicle navigation system is removed from the first vehicle, "selectively removed from the docking station 24 of

the first vehicle 72," and is installed in a second vehicle, "easily installed into the docking station 24 of the second vehicle 74." (Instant specification at page 8, lines 6-8 and FIG. 4).

As described, the navigation system is easily portable between or among a plurality of vehicles 72, 74. (Instant specification at page 10, lines 10-11 and FIG. 4). Advantageously, "a household with at least two vehicles 72, 74 is easily able to transport (and thus avoid duplicating) significant components (such as the computer module 26 and/or OIM 22) between vehicles 72, 74)." (Instant specification at page 9, lines 14-17).

One or more of the foregoing advantages are achieved by the present claimed subject matter as recited in the method of independent claim 23 which provides: "A method for using a vehicle navigation system including the steps of: a. removably securing a CPU and inertial sensor in a first vehicle; b. removing the CPU and at least one inertial sensor from the first vehicle; c. after step b., removably securing the CPU and the at least one inertial sensor in a second vehicle."

One or more of the foregoing advantages are achieved by the present claimed subject matter as recited in the method of independent claim 30 which provides: "A method for installing a vehicle navigation system including the steps of: a. electrically connecting a first docking station to a vehicle power supply of a first vehicle; b. mounting the first docking station in the first vehicle; and c. removably mating a CPU and map database to the first docking station and removably securing a navigational sensor in the first vehicle."

One or more of the foregoing advantages are achieved by the present claimed subject matter as recited in the method of independent claim 35 which provides: "A method for installing a vehicle system including the steps of: a. electrically connecting a first docking station to a vehicle power supply of a first vehicle; b. mounting the first docking station in the first vehicle; and c. removably mating a CPU and an inertial sensor to the first docking station, said inertial sensor automatically calibratable to the first vehicle."

One or more of the foregoing advantages are achieved by the present claimed subject matter as recited in the method of independent claim 39 which provides: "A method for using the vehicle navigation system including the steps of: a) storing first vehicle data regarding operation of the vehicle navigation system when installed in a first vehicle; b) storing second vehicle data regarding operation of the vehicle navigation system when installed in a second vehicle; c) selectively retrieving either the first vehicle data or the second vehicle data; and d) propagating the position of the vehicle navigation system based upon the first vehicle data or second vehicle data selected in said step c)."

One or more of the foregoing advantages are achieved by the present claimed subject matter as recited in the method of independent claim 40 which provides: "A method for using a vehicle navigation system including the steps of: a. electrically connecting a navigation system comprising a CPU, an inertial sensor and a display to a vehicle power supply of a first vehicle; b. removing the CPU, the inertial sensor and the display from the first vehicle; c. after step b., electrically connecting the CPU, the inertial sensor and the display to a vehicle power supply in a second vehicle."

VI. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

I. Kamiya in combination with Kodama and Hollenberg fails to render obvious the claimed subject matter

II. Kamiya in combination with Kodama and Avitan fails to render obvious the claimed subject matter

III. Kamiya in combination with Kodama and Ito fails to render obvious the claimed subject matter

IV. Kamiya in view of Kodama and further in view of Ito and Avitan fails to render obvious the claimed subject matter

V. Kamiya in view of Kodama and further in view of Ito, Avitan, and Hollenberg fails to render obvious the claimed subject matter

VII. Argument

I. Kamiya in combination with Kodama and Hollenberg fails to render obvious the claimed subject matter.

The primary reference, Kamiya, discloses a navigation apparatus for vehicles including a vehicle-side unit and a detachable unit. The vehicle-side unit includes a GPS receiver connected to a GPS antenna. The detachable unit includes an MMECU which is described as controlling operation of the combined unit. (Kamiya at abstract and FIG. 1). The navigation sensors, i.e., GPS receiver 11 and gyroscope 12, form part of the vehicle-side unit. Kamiya at column 9, lines 45). Kamiya's detachable unit fails to include a navigational sensor or a docking station as required by the claimed subject matter.

1. Kodama is not combinable with Kamiya and Hollenberg

The Examiner states that claims 1, 3, 5-17, 30-31, and 33-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamiya in view of Kodama and further in view of Hollenberg; however, the Examiner has failed to satisfy the burden for setting forth a prima facie case of obviousness. The Examiner has not identified any teaching or suggestion or provided any rationale regarding the asserted combination of Kodama with either Kamiya or Hollenberg. The Examiner mentions Kodama yet fails to identify a motivation to combine.

A statement that combinations of the prior art to meet the claimed invention would have been well within the ordinary skill of the art is not sufficient to establish a prima facie case of obviousness without some objective reason to combine the teachings of the references. See MPEP 2143.01 quoting Ex parte Levengood, 28 USPQ2d 1300 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993). The Office Action merely stated that the reference can be combined, which Appellants contend to the contrary, and does not state any desirability for making the combination. In other words, the Office Action failed to supply any objective reasons to combine the applied references.

In accordance with MPEP §2143.01 and Al-Site Corp. v. VSI Int'l Inc., 174 F.3d 1308, 50 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1999), the Examiner was requested to identify a teaching, suggestion, or motivation in either reference or to provide an affidavit of facts within the personal knowledge of the Examiner per MPEP §2144.03 providing a motivation or suggestion to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the argued combination. The Examiner has neither identified any teaching in Kamiya or Kodama or Hollenberg motivating or suggesting the asserted combination to a person of ordinary skill in the art nor provided an affidavit because there is no teaching to be found. For at least this reason, the rejection should be reversed.

"When an obviousness determination is based on multiple prior art references, there must be a showing of some 'teaching, suggestion, or reason' to combine the references." Winner International Royalty Corp. v. Wang, 202 F. 3rd 1340, 1348 53 USPQ2d 1580, 1586 (Fed. Cir. 2000). The Examiner has failed to make such a showing supporting the applied combination of references and therefore the applied combination of references is improper. The Examiner is in error for any of the above reasons and has not made out a prima facie case of obviousness, and the rejection of claim 1 should be reversed.

2. Kodama fails to cure the deficiencies of Kamiya

The Examiner admits that Kamiya fails to disclose "a docking station which is matable with the computer module station, and including at least a navigation sensor matable to the computer module station." However, the Examiner appears to have modified the language of the present claimed subject matter, i.e., "the computer module further includes at least one navigational sensor," and reads the claim as requiring only a navigation sensor in a removable module. This is an incorrect interpretation of the claimed subject matter and Kodama fails to teach or suggest a computer module selectively matable with a docking station and including a navigational sensor, instead Kodama describes a navigation sensor unit 12 selectively attachable to a base unit 13. "[GPS unit] 11 and [navigation sensor unit] 12 may be mounted to

the base 13 temporarily." (Kodama Abstract). In Kodama, a central processing unit 23 is part of the base unit 13 and not part of a computer module matable with the base unit.

Even assuming arguendo the combination of Kodama with Kamiya, i.e., assuming a person of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to include a removable navigation sensor according to Kodama in the system of Kamiya, the Examiner still has failed to render obvious the present claimed subject matter. A person of ordinary skill would, at most, have an additional removable component, i.e., a removable navigation sensor according to Kodama, above and beyond the detachable unit and vehicle-side unit of Kamiya. This is not the same as a computer module including a navigational sensor as claimed in claim 1. For either of the above reasons, the rejection of claim 1 should be reversed.

Claims 3 and 5-17 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1, include further important limitations, and are patentable over the applied combination of references for at least the reasons advanced above with respect to claim 1. The rejection of claims 3 and 5-17 should be reversed.

Claims 30-31, and 33-38 are patentable over the applied combination of references for reasons similar to those advanced above with respect to claim 1. The rejection of claims 14-17, 30-31, and 33-38 should be reversed.

II. Kamiya in combination with Kodama and Avitan fails to render obvious the claimed subject matter

The Examiner states that claims 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamiya in view of Kodama and further in view of Avitan; however, as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Kodama fails to cure the deficiencies of Kamiya and

the Examiner has failed to satisfy the burden for setting forth a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to either Kodama or Avitan.

1. Kodama fails to cure the deficiencies of Kamiya and is not combinable with Kamiya

The Examiner's assertions with respect to Kamiya in view of Kodama have been addressed above with respect to claim 1 and are incorporated herein by reference. Neither Kamiya nor Kodama include a computer module including a CPU and at least one of an inertial sensor and a GPS receiver. For at least this reason, the rejection should be reversed.

2. Avitan is not combinable with Kamiya

Further, Avitan is not combinable with Kamiya and the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness as the Examiner has failed to identify a teaching or suggestion in either reference sufficient to motivate a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time to combine the references. The Examiner asserts that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated in order to facilitate implementing a control module to different vehicles as in Avitan; however, in Avitan the different data is stability criteria for a number of different trucks in order to minimize the need for highly trained personnel for installation. (Avitan at column 3, lines 43-51). The Avitan system does not fairly envision installation of a computer module in a first vehicle and subsequently in a second vehicle, rather Avitan describes including vehicle data for both the first and second vehicles in two computer modules, one of the computer modules being installed in a first vehicle and the other installed in a second vehicle. As such, a person of ordinary skill would not have been motivated to combine Kamiya with Avitan and the rejection of claim 18 should be reversed.

For either of the above reasons, the rejection of claim 18 should be reversed.

Claims 19-22 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 18, include further important limitations, and are patentable over the applied combination of references for at least the reasons advanced above with respect to claim 18. The rejection of claims 19-22 should be reversed.

3. Avitan fails to teach propagating position of a vehicle

Further, with specific reference to claim 22, the Examiner admits that Avitan fails to teach propagating position of the vehicle based on the first and second vehicle data. The Examiner has asserted, without identifying any teaching or suggestion, that it would have been well known to transmit position of a vehicle based on the position data of the vehicle. Appellants do not understand how it would be obvious to modify a system, which by the Examiner's admission does not propagate position of a vehicle, to transmit position of the vehicle. In the Advisory Action mailed June 17, 2005, the Examiner asserts that it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to include position data in the memory of Avitan; however, the Examiner has already admitted that Avitan fails to teach propagation of position data. The Examiner has again failed to identify a teaching or suggestion in any of the applied references for the asserted combination or specifically, the modification of the Avitan reference. For at least this reason, the rejection of claim 22 should be reversed.

III. Kamiya in combination with Kodama and Ito fails to render obvious the claimed subject matter

The Examiner states that claims 23 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamiya in view of Kodama and further in view of Ito.

1. Kodama fails to cure the deficiencies of Kamiya and is not combinable with Kamiya

The Examiner's assertions with respect to Kamiya in view of Kodama have been addressed above with respect to claim 1 and are incorporated herein by reference. Neither Kamiya nor Kodama include a computer module including a CPU and at least one of an inertial sensor and a GPS receiver. For at least this reason, the rejection should be reversed.

Further, Kamiya fails to disclose removably securing an inertial sensor in a vehicle, rather Kamiya describes the inertial sensor installed in the vehicle-side unit 1, not the detachable unit 2. Kodama fails to disclose removably securing a CPU in a vehicle.

For either of the above reasons, the rejection of claims 23 and 40 should be reversed.

2. Ito fails to cure the deficiencies of Kamiya and Kodama

Ito discloses an integrated instrument panel switch assembly; however, the Examiner has failed to identify any teaching or suggestion in Ito of removing the CPU and inertial sensor from one vehicle and installing the CPU and inertial sensor in a second vehicle. At most, Ito discloses a simplified assembly process for an instrument panel assembly. The Examiner's assertion that it would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to implement the cavity and the electric circuit of Ito to the vehicles in order to allow the CPU of Kamiya to be easily removably installed in different vehicles is incorrect as the Examiner has failed to identify any such teaching in either reference. As none of Kamiya, Ito, nor Kodama teaches removably securing the CPU in a second vehicle, the rejection should be reversed.

For either of the above reasons, the rejection of claims 23 and 40 should be reversed.

IV. Kamiya in view of Kodama and further in view of Ito and Avitan fail to render obvious the claimed subject matter

The Examiner states that claims 24-28, 39, and 41-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamiya in view of Kodama and further in view of Ito and Avitan.

Claims 24-28 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 23, include further important limitations, and are patentable over the applied references for at least the reasons advanced above with respect to claim 23. The rejection of claims 24-28 should be reversed.

With specific reference to claims 26, 27, 39, and 41-42, the Examiner is referred to the above discussion regarding claim 22.

Claims 43 and 44 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 40, include further important limitations, and are patentable over the applied combination of references for at least the reasons advanced above with respect to claim 40. The rejection of claims 43 and 44 should be reversed.

V. Kamiya in view of Kodama and further in view of Ito, Avitan, and Hollenberg fail to render obvious the claimed subject matter

The Examiner states that claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamiya in view of Kodama and further in view of Ito, Avitan, and Hollenberg.

Claim 29 is patentable over the applied combination of references for at least the reasons advanced above with respect to claims 26, and 23 from which claim 29 depends and for reasons similar to those advanced above with respect to claim 1. For at least this reason, the rejection of claim 29 should be reversed.

VIII. Conclusion

Based on the foregoing arguments, reversal of the rejections is in order.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry E. Spencer et al

By: 

Randy A. Noranbrock
Reg. No. 42,940

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 310
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111 KMB/RAN/iyr
Facsimile: (703) 518-5499
Date: December 19, 2005

KMB:RAN/iyr

IX. Claims Appendix

1. A vehicle navigation system comprising:

a computer module including a processor and a map database;

a docking station, said computer module selectively matable with said docking station ;

wherein the computer module further includes at least one navigational sensor.

3. The navigation system of Claim 1, wherein said at least one navigational sensor is at least one of a GPS receiver and an accelerometer.

5. The navigation system of Claim 1, wherein said computer module includes a first electrical connector and said docking station includes a second electrical connector, said first electrical connector becoming electrically connected to the second electrical connector when the computer module is mated with the docking station.

6. The navigation system of Claim 5, wherein said first electrical connector is electrically connected to said CPU.

7. The navigation system of Claim 6, wherein said first electrical connector is electrically connected to a GPS receiver on said computer module.

8. The navigation system of Claim 5, further including an operator interface module electrically connected to said second connector when said computer module is mated with the docking station.

9. The navigation system of Claim 8, wherein said operator interface module includes a display.

10. The navigation system of Claim 5, wherein said docking station is fixedly mounted in a first vehicle.

11. The navigation system of Claim 1, wherein said computer module further includes means for determining a position of the navigation system relative to the map database.

12. The navigation system of Claim 11, further including means for determining a route from a beginning point to an ending point via said map database.

13. The navigation system of Claim 12, wherein the computer module includes an inertial sensor generating a motion signal, said processor propagating position based upon said motion signal.

14. A vehicle navigation system comprising:

a docking station fixedly mounted in a first vehicle;

a computer module including a CPU, map database, GPS receiver and at least one accelerometer, the computer module comprising a self-contained unit which is selectively matable with and removable from the docking station, the computer module including a first electrical connector which is electrically connected with a second electrical connector on the docking station when the computer module is mated to the docking station, said second electrical connector being electrically connected to a power supply in the first vehicle; and

an operator interface module selectively electrically connected to the CPU of the computer module, said operator interface module including a display and a plurality of user activatable switches.

15. The vehicle navigation system of Claim 14, wherein the computer module further includes means for determining a position of the vehicle navigation system relative to the map database and means for determining a route via the map database from the current location to a destination in the map database selected by the operator interface module.

16. The navigation system of Claim 15 further including a second docking station fixedly mounted in a second vehicle, said computer module selectively matable with said second docking station.

17. The navigation system of Claim 16 wherein said operator interface module is selectively connectable to said first docking station or said second docking station.

18. A vehicle navigation system comprising:

a computer module including a CPU, map database, first vehicle data, second vehicle data, and at least one of an inertial sensor and a GPS receiver;

said computer module utilizing said first vehicle data when the computer module is installed in the first vehicle and said second vehicle data when said computer module is installed in the second vehicle.

19. The vehicle navigation system of Claim 18 further including a user interface for providing user input regarding whether to use the first vehicle data or the second vehicle data.

20. The navigation system of Claim 19, wherein the user interface includes a display and user operable switches for selecting between the first vehicle data and second vehicle data.

21. The vehicle navigation system of Claim 18, wherein the first vehicle data includes information regarding the orientation of the computer module relative to the first vehicle when the computer module is installed in the first vehicle and the second vehicle data includes information regarding the orientation of the computer module relative to the second vehicle when the computer module is installed in the second vehicle.

22. The navigation system of Claim 21, wherein the CPU propagates position of the vehicle navigation system based upon the first vehicle data when the computer module is installed in the first vehicle and based upon the second vehicle data when the computer module is installed in the second vehicle.

23. A method for using a vehicle navigation system including the steps of:

a. removably securing a CPU and inertial sensor in a first vehicle;

b. removing the CPU and at least one inertial sensor from the first vehicle;

c. after step b., removably securing the CPU and the at least one inertial sensor in a second vehicle.

24. The method of Claim 23 further including the steps of propagating the position of the first vehicle after said step a. based upon data from the at least one inertial sensor.

25. The method of Claim 24, further including the step of propagating the position of the second vehicle based upon data from the inertial sensor after said step c.

26. The method of Claim 25, further including the steps of:

storing first vehicle data regarding the orientation of the at least one inertial sensor when installed in the first vehicle; and

storing second vehicle data regarding the orientation of the at least one inertial sensor when installed in the second vehicle.

27. The method of Claim 26 further including the steps of:

propagating the position of the first vehicle based upon the first vehicle data when the CPU and first inertial sensor are installed in the first vehicle; and

propagating the position of the second vehicle based upon the second vehicle data when the CPU and at least one inertial sensor are installed in the second vehicle.

28. The method of Claim 27 further including the step of manually selecting whether to use the first vehicle data or second vehicle data via a user input device.

29. The method of Claim 28, wherein step a. includes the step of mating said CPU and at least one inertial sensor with a docking station mounted in the first vehicle.

30. A method for installing a vehicle navigation system including the steps of:

a. electrically connecting a first docking station to a vehicle power supply of a first vehicle;

b. mounting the first docking station in the first vehicle; and

c. removably mating a CPU and map database to the first docking station and removably securing a navigational sensor in the first vehicle.

31. The method of Claim 30 wherein the navigational sensor includes at least one of a GPS receiver and an accelerometer.

33. The method of Claim 30 further including the step of removably connecting a display to the first docking station.

34. The method Claim 30 further including the steps of:

d. removing the CPU and map database from the first docking station; and

e. after said step d, removably mating said CPU and said map database to a second docking station mounted in a second vehicle.

35. A method for installing a vehicle system including the steps of:

a. electrically connecting a first docking station to a vehicle power supply of a first vehicle;

b. mounting the first docking station in the first vehicle; and

c. removably mating a CPU and an inertial sensor to the first docking station, said inertial sensor automatically calibratable to the first vehicle.

36. The method of Claim 35 wherein said inertial sensor is an accelerometer.

37. The method of Claim 36 further including the step of removably connecting a display to the first docking station.

38. The method of Claim 35 further including the steps of:

d. removing the CPU and map database from the first docking station; and

e. after step d., removably mating said CPU and said map database to a second docking station mounted in a second vehicle.

39. A method for using the vehicle navigation system including the steps of:

a) storing first vehicle data regarding operation of the vehicle navigation system when installed in a first vehicle;

b) storing second vehicle data regarding operation of the vehicle navigation system when installed in a second vehicle;

c) selectively retrieving either the first vehicle data or the second vehicle data; and

d) propagating the position of the vehicle navigation system based upon the first

vehicle data or second vehicle data selected in said step c).

40. A method for using a vehicle navigation system including the steps of:

a. electrically connecting a navigation system comprising a CPU, an inertial sensor and a display to a vehicle power supply of a first vehicle;

b. removing the CPU, the inertial sensor and the display from the first vehicle;

c. after step b., electrically connecting the CPU, the inertial sensor and the display to a vehicle power supply in a second vehicle.

41. The method of Claim 40 further including the steps of propagating the position of the first vehicle after said step a. based upon data from the inertial sensor.

42. The method of Claim 41, further including the step of propagating the position of the second vehicle based upon data from the inertial sensor after said step c.

43. The method of Claim 42, further including the steps of removably mounting a GPS antenna to a roof of the first vehicle and connecting the GPS antenna to a GPS receiver in the navigation system before said step b.

44. The method of claim 43, wherein said step a. includes electrically connecting the GPS receiver to the power supply of the first vehicle, said step b. includes removing the GPS receiver from the first vehicle and said step c. includes electrically connecting the GPS receiver to the vehicle power supply in the second vehicle.

X. Evidence Appendix

None.

XI. Related Proceedings Appendix

None.